(Department...
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ
(ಇಲಾಖಾ ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ)
Dewan ದಿವಾನ್ Accession No. 4645
ದಿನಾಂಕ Date.....

That question does not arise.

MR. G. DEVOJI RAO (Seringapatam).

Q.—16. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(1) What is the amount of the total loss incurred by the Government and by the public on account of the recent fire to the Railway Goods Shed, Mysore?

(2) What is the value of the goods consigned to the Railway and covered by Risk Notes?

(3) Has any compensation been paid to the merchants and if not, does the Government propose to compensate them and to what extent?

(4) Has any committee been appointed by the Government to enquire into the causes of the fire whether due to accident or to wanton mischief and fixed the responsibility on any particular individual?

(5) Is the Government aware that there is an embezzlement of public money by the goods clerk and whether the fire to the goods shed can in any way be connected with an inspection regarding the embezzlement which had been fixed for the next day?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, RAILWAYS.—

A.—(1) Rs. 50,000. The original cost of the building was Rs. 10,000 and the value of the goods destroyed or damaged is about Rs. 40,000.

(2) Information not available.

(3) Under examination with the Officers of Government.

(4) The investigation at the Joint Enquiry by the Officers of Government including the City Magistrate and Assistant Superintendent, Railway Police, did not disclose that the fire was due to wanton mischief.

(5) The Government have no knowledge of the alleged or attempted embezzlement by the goods clerk.

Supplementary Question.

Mr. Devoji Rao.—

Will the Government state whether any notice was given to the consigners and the consignees informing them of the damage caused to the goods?

Dewan.—

That question does not arise out of the answers to your interpellation.

Mr. Devoji Rao.—

Had not any officer of Government inspected the goods shed two days before the fire and did not the goods clerk deposit a sum of Rs. 2,000 about this time?

Dewan.—

That is not a supplementary question. Government want previous notice to answer it. The member is welcome to bring to notice any embezzlement which he thinks has taken place.

Mr. G. Paramasiviah.—

Are not Government in a position to say what amounts were claimed by way of compensation?

Dewan.—

Government have no information about it ready at hand.

Mr. Ramachandra Rao Sindia.—

Was the enquiry referred to in answer (4) above held in camera or openly?

Dewan.—

Government are not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. Md. Sheriff.—

Were the parties allowed to clear goods which were damaged in part? If such articles were auctioned out, were the parties informed previously?

Dewan.—

Government have no information on those points.

Mr. Md. Sheriff.—

It having come to the notice of many of the members that there has been embezzlement of public money on the part of the goods clerk, what action do the Government intend taking in the matter?

Dewan.—

Government have no information on that point. Government will certainly take action if specific embezzlements are brought to notice.

MESSRS. HOSKOPPA KRISHNA RAO, JAMMATIGE SHAMA JOIS AND HONNIAH HEGGADE (Koppa Taluk).

Q.—17. Will the Government be pleased to furnish the following information:—

(*a*) the amount of grants gazetted from time to time in the months of July, August and September 1924 on account of Flood Relief Operations;

(*b*) the amount actually spent out of those grants in those months for the relief of actual sufferers due to flood;

(*c*) the date or dates on which the distribution of relief actually took place;

(*d*) whether it was before or after the collection of subscriptions from the public, that the distribution of relief was ordered to be made;

(*e*) what is the total amount of subscription raised from the public?

(*f*) the amount spent out of the above and the balance if any, on that account;

(*g*) the actual remissions made in the assessment of lands damaged;

(*h*) the amount of remissions (districtwar) recommended by the Local Officers and the amount finally sanctioned by Government;

(*i*) the extent, both in area and amount, of damages to lands in the flooded area;

(*j*) the difference in the extent of damages between the lists prepared by the special Sheikdars in the first instance and verified by the local officers, and those finally submitted to Government;

(*k*) the amount finally recommended for remission by the officers who conducted Huzur Jamabandi in the respective taluks;

(*l*) the actual variation between the probable amount of remissions as per lists of special Sheikdars and that recommended by the Huzur Jamabandi Officers;

(*m*) were any non-officials associated with the preparation of list of damages and were they consulted before making final recommendations for the remission of assessment?

(*n*) the number of applications received from raiyats for Takavi Loans for repairing the damaged lands and building houses and the number rejected;